

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the office action dated June 2, 2008. This amendment is responsive to the June 2, 2008 Office Action.

By this amendment, claims 1, 10 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The subject matter that the antenna arrangement folds (hinges) from the first position to the second position is described in Figs 1 and 2 of the original specification and also paragraph 14. The element that the reflecting surface cooperates with the antenna arrangement to establish a directional antenna mode is not new matter as it is disclosed in paragraphs 6 and 15 of the original specification. Reconsideration of this application as amended is requested.

### **Substance of Interview**

The applicant also acknowledges, with thanks the personal interview granted on 20 August 2008. Attending the interview was the applicant's representative, Larry B. Donovan, and the examiner, Eugene Yun. No exhibits were shown or demonstrations conducted. Claim 1 was discussed and contrasted with Capdepuy. Applicant's argument focused on feature that antenna folded into reflective surface. No agreement was reached. No other pertinent matters were discussed.

### **Prior Art Matters**

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 16-24, and 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,233,627 to Proctor et al. (*hereinafter*, "Proctor") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,372 to Neagley et al. (*hereinafter*, "Neagley") and U.S. Patent No. 4,821,045 to Capdepuy et al. (*hereinafter*, "Capdepuy"). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for reasons that will now be set forth.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 20, as currently amended, recite that the antenna system operates as an omni directional antenna system while in a first position. While in the first position, the antenna system is perpendicular to a reflective surface. The arrangement then folds into a second position (claim 10 further recites a hinge) where the antenna system is parallel with

the antenna arrangement and in a position where the reflective surface cooperates with the antenna system to establish a directional antenna configuration.

By contrast, Capdepuy, as discussed in the interview rotates reflectors about axes. The antenna arrangement in Capdepuy does not fold (or employ a hinge) for moving from the first position to the second position.

The aforementioned deficiencies in Capdepuy with respect to claims 1, 10 and 20 are not remedied by any teaching of Proctor and/or Neagley. As the examiner correctly points out in the last office action, the combination of Proctor and Neagley does not teach a first operational position perpendicular with the signal reflecting member and a second operational position parallel with the signal reflecting member.

Therefore, for the reasons just set forth, neither Proctor, Neagley nor Capdepuy, alone or in any combination, teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 10 and 20; consequently independent claims 1, 10 and 20 are not obvious in view of the combination of Proctor, Neagley and/or Capdepuy.

Claims 31, 27 and 24-21 directly depend from claim 20 and thus contain each and every element of claim 20 and therefore are not anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited prior art for the same reasons set forth for claim 20. Claims 30, 16-19 and 11-13 directly depend from claim 10 and thus contain each and every element of claim 10 and therefore are not anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited prior art for the same reasons set forth for claim 10. Claims 32, 29, 28, 7-9 and 2-4 directly depend from claim 1 and thus contain each and every element of claim 1 and therefore are not anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited prior art for the same reasons set forth for claim 1.

**Conclusion**

Withdrawal of the rejections to this application is requested for the reasons set forth herein and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 72255/00019.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-2-2008

  
Larry B. Donovan  
Registration No. 47,230  
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP  
1150 Huntington Bldg.  
925 Euclid Ave.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414  
**Customer No.: 23380**  
Tel.: (216) 696-3864  
Fax: (216) 592-5009